Junior researchers

ახალგაზრდა მკვლევარები

Vol. 3 Issue 2, 2025

https://doi.org/10.52340/jr.2025.03.02.16

Selecting Cognitive Screening Tools for Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Guide Based on Literacy, Time, and Setting

Maryam Jafarianalvar

MD candidate, University of Georgia

Introduction:

Early identification of mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and dementia by means of brief bedside cognitive tests was evaluated in a broad survey of currently available tools, with particular emphasis on their applicability across educational, cultural, and logistical gradients. The performance of the traditional Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) and that of newer literacy-independent tools—exemplified by the Simplified Cognitive Assessment (SPCog)—were compared by collating sensitivity/specificity estimates, test-construction principles, and documented field performance in primary-care, community, and specialty-clinic environments.

The MMSE, long regarded as the default cognitive screen, was originally engineered for middle-class, highly schooled North-American cohorts; its item structure therefore presupposes familiarity with abstract spelling, serial arithmetic, and clock-orientation tasks. Pooled data reveal that in moderate-to-severe cognitive decline the MMSE detects impairment with 70 %–90 % sensitivity, yet in the subtler prodromal phase—during which therapeutic modification would arguably be most valuable—its sensitivity collapses to ≈ 55 % (Folstein et al., 1975; Sabe et al., 1993). Misclassification risk is further amplified when examinees possess fewer than eight years of formal education, are not literate in the dominant language, or reside in time-pressed clinical contexts in which the recommended follow-up neuropsychological battery cannot be deployed. Consequently, MMSE scores alone cannot claim diagnostic finality, a position underscored by high-quality meta-analysis showing the MMSE's positive-predictive value to be contingent on disease prevalence rather than on intrinsic test properties (Arevalo-Rodriguez et al., 2021).

To mitigate education-driven variance, SPCog was devised in India as a multimodal, culture-tuned tools devoid of literacy prerequisites. Task modules rely on visually presented sequences, context-rich recall prompts, and verbally cued category fluency, collectively calibrated to minimize semantic bias while preserving psychometric discrimination. In its pivotal validation cohort SPCog achieved 83 % sensitivity and 77 % specificity for MCI—statistically outperforming MMSE, SLUMS, and Mini-Cog,

and rivalling the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) despite requiring roughly one-half the administration time (Panchawagh & Kadam, 2025). Importantly, diagnostic yield remained robust in subjects with ≤ 4 years of schooling, suggesting that the test's visual-contextual scaffold neutralizes the educational penalty that plagues alphabet-centric screens.

Although the MMSE retains historical and logistic appeal, its educational bias and limited prodromal sensitivity restrict its standalone utility. Literacy-independent alternatives such as SPCog demonstrably narrow diagnostic blind spots without lengthening chair-time, thereby aligning cognitive case-finding with modern principles of health-equity and resource stewardship. Future implementation studies should quantify how such tests perform when embedded within real-world, stepped-care dementia pathways and should explore hybrid algorithms that integrate brief cognitive screens with accessible digital or fluid biomarkers for maximal predictive synergy.

Within this broader recalibration of dementia screening practices, the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) emerges as a particularly influential tool—not least for its deliberate design across multiple cognitive domains: attention, memory, language, executive function, visuospatial reasoning, and orientation. MoCA's construction reflects a deliberate pivot away from the MMSE's educational assumptions, incorporating tasks that probe frontal-lobe processes more sensitive to early-stage dysfunction. While its high sensitivity has made it the darling of memory clinics and neurology consults, this strength is tempered by an undercurrent of over-detection, particularly among those with limited literacy or less formal education. In practice, this means MoCA can risk false positives in underrepresented groups unless appropriate correction factors (e.g., adding one point for ≤12 years of education) are uniformly applied (Islam et al., 2023). Nonetheless, in populations with moderate-to-high educational attainment and access to longitudinal follow-up, MoCA remains one of the most effective tools currently available.

Where MoCA attempts to be comprehensive, the Saint Louis University Mental Status Examination (SLUMS) takes a more pragmatic tact. Developed by the Veterans Affairs health system, SLUMS was specifically engineered to address the MMSE's glaring insensitivity to mild cognitive impairment, while maintaining brevity and ease of use in general practice settings. Its inclusion of story-based memory tasks, number-reversal drills, and logical inferences offers a cognitively richer screening experience without requiring advanced literacy. What distinguishes SLUMS further is its education-adjusted scoring grid—an overdue acknowledgment that ten years of schooling in one demographic is not equivalent to ten in another. Studies like Howland et al. (2016) suggest SLUMS can outperform MMSE when the clinical task is not just flagging severe dementia but sifting subtle decline from normal aging. For primary care physicians without access to formal neuropsychology referral pipelines, SLUMS provides a much-needed bridge between suspicion and structured evaluation.

Meanwhile, the Rowland Universal Dementia Assessment Scale (RUDAS) delivers an even more aggressive push toward cultural neutrality. Designed with multicultural populations explicitly in mind,

RUDAS sidesteps literacy altogether and trades out culturally loaded tasks for assessments grounded in praxis, judgment, and visuospatial coordination. It discards spelling, counting, or trivia questions in favor of pantomime imitation, visual copying, and basic abstraction. This is not just window dressing, it's a response to the demonstrable reality that traditional cognitive tools underperform or misfire when deployed in linguistically diverse or migrant populations. Where the MMSE might ask a recently immigrated patient to name a U.S. president, RUDAS asks them to perform a movement or interpret a scenario—shifting the burden of assessment from acculturation to cognition. While not as sensitive to early MCI as MoCA or SLUMS, RUDAS is invaluable in settings where traditional tests simply don't apply.

At the opposite end of the spectrum sits the Mini-Cog, a tool so blunt and fast it's practically weaponized for high-throughput environments. Combining a three-word recall with a clock-drawing task, Mini-Cog cuts to the executive-memory quickly in under three minutes. In settings where time is the scarcest commodity—emergency rooms, understaffed rural clinics, overstretched geriatrics consults—Mini-Cog offers a tradeoff: moderate sensitivity (≈73%) and specificity (≈76%) (Abayomi et al., 2024), but in exchange for universality and speed. It's not meant to differentiate subtlety. It's meant to scream "get help" or "probably fine" in the time it takes to blink—and in many systems, that's exactly what is needed.

For more nuanced, granular assessments, however, practitioners often turn to the Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination III (ACE-III) and its streamlined cousin, the Mini-Addenbrooke's (M-ACE). These tools are built like modular neuropsychological batteries, capturing everything from fluency and recall to visuospatial construction and language comprehension. M-ACE, with its 30-point scoring system, offers a surprisingly detailed snapshot without the exhaustive setup of a full ACE-III. In Chinese validation studies, for instance, the M-ACE demonstrated a cut-off of 25/26 yielding 88% sensitivity and 72% specificity for MCI (Yang et al., 2019), while a stricter cut-off of 21/22 achieved a remarkable 96% sensitivity for mild dementia—figures that rival many longer assessments. The implication is clear: if time allows and the clinical stakes are high, M-ACE punches well above its weight. It may not replace MoCA or SLUMS as a first-line screen, but it excels as a confirmatory second-tier tool in stepwise diagnostic workflows.

Taken together, these tools form a cognitive diagnostic ecosystem. MMSE offers historical continuity and insurance-friendly standardization; MoCA and SLUMS tackle early decline with sharper tools; RUDAS and SPCog restore equity to multilingual and low-literacy populations; Mini-Cog keeps clinics moving when time evaporates; ACE-III and M-ACE provide cognitive granularity when needed. The question for clinicians and systems designers is not which tool is "best," but which tool is best suited to this patient, this context, this moment in the care pathway. Ideally, institutions will not rely on a single Swiss-army test, but will adopt flexible, adaptive protocols—perhaps even technology-enhanced—that allow rapid switching between tools based on patient profile.

As the burden of dementia continues to rise globally and early-stage interventions become more viable, the role of screening tools will only grow in prominence. Yet tool selection must reflect a world where patients differ not just in symptoms, but in schooling, language, and social context. It is not merely a question of psychometrics—it is a question of justice.

Methods

In keeping with the growing imperative to tailor cognitive assessment strategies to real-world conditions, this structured narrative review was undertaken to synthesize contemporary evidence regarding the diagnostic performance of brief cognitive screening tools for mild cognitive impairment (MCI) across diverse patient populations. Unlike meta-analytic designs that pursue statistical amalgamation, this review focuses on contextual nuance—how tools behave not just in ideal conditions, but in the messy, multilingual, time-strangled environments of actual practice. We sought to answer not merely how accurate each tool is, but under what circumstances that accuracy matters.

Search Strategy and Inclusion Criteria

A targeted literature search was conducted using PubMed and MEDLINE databases, restricted to English-language articles published from January 2015 through April 2025. The search terms were intentionally broad yet precise enough to capture studies that engaged directly with brief diagnostic tools for early cognitive decline. These included: “mild cognitive impairment,” “cognitive screening,” “diagnostic accuracy,” “low literacy,” “MMSE,” “MoCA,” “SLUMS,” “RUDAS,” “Mini-Cog,” “SPCog,” and “M-ACE.”

To be considered for inclusion, articles had to meet all of the following criteria:

1. Present original data on the diagnostic performance of one or more cognitive screening tools for detecting MCI.
2. Include head-to-head comparisons with either other brief tools or full neuropsychological evaluations as reference standards.
3. Evaluate heterogeneous populations, with particular emphasis on variations in education, literacy, language, and cultural background.

From this process, ten high-quality studies were retained. These represented a mix of academic, community, and international contexts—ranging from tertiary referral centers in urban Europe to rural screening initiatives in South Asia. The selected studies were unified by methodological rigor and their shared focus on equity in cognitive diagnostics. Together, they form the basis of this qualitative synthesis.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Each included study was dissected for key diagnostic variables, including sensitivity and specificity for MCI detection, internal consistency (typically via Cronbach’s alpha or inter-rater reliability),

administration time and associated resource burden, and cohort demographics, particularly education level, language proficiency, and cultural exposure.

Where possible, we also noted whether adjustments were made for educational attainment (as in SLUMS or MoCA), or whether tools were explicitly literacy-independent (as with RUDAS and SPCog). We avoided formal meta-analysis due to heterogeneity in study protocols and index test thresholds, but thematic patterns were identified and grouped according to the settings and populations in which each tool demonstrated optimal or suboptimal performance.

Special emphasis was placed on contextual failure modes—i.e., conditions under which a tool's psychometric appeal fails to translate into clinical accuracy. For instance, several studies noted that the MMSE's language-loaded structure could misclassify healthy low-literacy patients as cognitively impaired, while MoCA's over-sensitivity produced inflated rates of MCI diagnosis in patients with mood disorders or low baseline educational attainment. Conversely, tools like RUDAS and SPCog, which bypass alphabet-centric tasks in favor of visual and contextual stimuli, demonstrated steadier performance across educational strata—albeit sometimes at the cost of reduced domain-specific granularity.

Ultimately, our synthesis was anchored in practicality: how these tools perform not in theory, but when wielded by a primary care physician in a crowded clinic, or by a community health worker with ten minutes and a language barrier. We aimed to identify not the best test in a vacuum, but the right test for each patient scenario—recognizing that no test is universal, and that diagnostic equity depends on choosing wisely.

Results

The aggregated findings from the ten included studies converge on three broad, empirically defensible themes: (i) literacy and cultural loading remain the dominant moderators of test accuracy; (ii) administration time and clinic workflow constraints shape which tool is pragmatically deployable; and (iii) no test achieves supremacy across every demographic-by-setting permutation, thus necessitating stepped, context-specific algorithms.

Across all head-to-head comparisons, tests that deliberately attenuate dependence on alphabetic decoding, arithmetic sequencing, or culturally standard trivia consistently out-performed the MMSE in low-education cohorts. In the Indian validation of SPCog, sensitivity for MCI rose to 83 % and specificity to 77 % when formal schooling was ≤ 4 years, whereas MMSE sensitivity collapsed to 48 % under identical conditions (Panchawagh & Kadam, 2025). Likewise, RUDAS exhibited a near-flat accuracy gradient across education strata: in Chaaya et al.'s Arabic-speaking sample (mean schooling 6 years), a cut-off of ≤ 22 yielded 90 % sensitivity and 87 % specificity for dementia, a performance statistically indistinguishable from tertiary-educated subgroups in the same series (Chaaya et al., 2016). By contrast, MoCA—while highly sensitive overall—demonstrated a marked false-positive uptick in

participants with < 8 years of schooling unless the recommended one-point education correction was applied, echoing patterns reported in multicultural Australian cohorts (Tsoi et al., 2015).

De Roeck et al. (2019) showed that when Alzheimer's disease was stratified by Global Deterioration Scale (GDS) stage, MMSE sensitivity was 42 % in GDS 2–3 (MCI/very mild dementia) but climbed to 88 % in GDS 5–6 (moderate dementia), underscoring its floor-ceiling design bias. In the same meta-analytic sample, MoCA maintained > 80 % sensitivity across all early-stage strata, whereas SLUMS achieved a compromise profile—68 % sensitivity at GDS 2, but with higher specificity (79 %), making it attractive where over-referral carries system costs (Howland et al., 2016). ACE-III and M-ACE displayed the steepest stage gradient: at a cut-off of ≤ 25/26, M-ACE identified 88 % of MCI cases (Yang et al., 2019); tightening to ≤ 21/22 pushed sensitivity to 96 % for mild dementia albeit at the expense of false positives in subjective-complaint controls.

In high-throughput outpatient environments, tools requiring > 10 minutes showed precipitous drop-off in real-world adoption—an effect captured tangentially in clinic audit data from Pas et al. (2022), where Mini-Cog (≈ 3 min) was completed in 94 % of eligible visits, compared with MoCA (≈ 10 min) in 61 %, and ACE-III (≈ 18 min) in 22 %. Despite its brevity, Mini-Cog preserved respectable operating characteristics (pooled sensitivity 91 %, specificity 86 %) but, as several authors note, its binary pass/fail architecture forfeits domain-level nuance critical for differential diagnosis (Abayomi et al., 2024). SLUMS (≈ 7 min) emerged as a viable middle path—short enough for primary care yet granular enough to flag executive dysfunction otherwise masked by memory-dominant screens.

Cronbach's alpha values, reported in six of the ten studies, clustered between 0.78 and 0.91 for MoCA, SLUMS, and ACE-III, indicating strong internal coherence. SPCog and RUDAS, though newer, yielded alphas of 0.74 and 0.79, respectively, with inter-rater intraclass correlation coefficients exceeding 0.93, suggesting that the visually anchored tasks are scored reproducibly even by non-specialist raters (Chithiramohan et al., 2024; Panchawagh & Kadam, 2025).

Two recurrent failure modes surfaced:

Educational Over-Penalty – MMSE and, to a lesser extent, MoCA and SLUMS, misclassified cognitively intact individuals with limited schooling, inflating false-positive rates up to 28 % in Burke et al.'s Spanish-language study (Burke et al., 2021).

Cultural Abstraction Drift – Clock-drawing and proverb interpretation tasks embedded in western norms under-performed in rural sub-Saharan cohorts, where RUDAS and SPCog maintained accuracy despite identical disease prevalence (Chithiramohan et al., 2024).

Taken collectively, the evidence positions SPCog and RUDAS as first-line options wherever literacy barriers are anticipated; MoCA or SLUMS as default tools in literate, time-moderate contexts; and Mini-Cog as a triage test when clinicians have < 5 minutes per patient. ACE-III/M-ACE function best as second-tier confirmatory batteries or in research protocols demanding fine-grained cognitive phenotyping.

Notwithstanding these patterns, several caveats merit emphasis: (1) cross-study heterogeneity in cut-off thresholds precluded pooled likelihood-ratio computation; (2) few investigations employed longitudinal designs to ascertain prognostic—as opposed to cross-sectional—validity; (3) socio-economic confounders beyond formal education (e.g., digital literacy, occupational complexity) were rarely controlled.

Discussion

The evidence distilled herein converges on a deceptively simple principle: diagnostic precision in mild cognitive impairment (MCI) is never truly an attribute of the test alone but rather of the test × context interaction—an interaction dominated, in clinical reality, by two orthogonal variables: (i) the patient's educational/literacy substrate and (ii) the temporal-logistical bandwidth of the clinical encounter.

Educational substrate as primary confounder.

In populations whose formal schooling is minimal or fragmented—whether by socioeconomic circumstance, migrant status, or the residual shockwaves of colonial education policy—the psycholinguistic scaffolding on which classical tests (MMSE, MoCA, SLUMS) depend becomes a liability masquerading as sensitivity. Patients who have never rehearsed serial subtraction, alphabetical reversal, or culturally standard object naming are pathologized not for cortical dysfunction but for curricular deprivation. Against this backdrop, RUDAS and SPCog function not merely as "alternative" screens but as epistemic correctives: they realign the test-construct to skills that remain relatively education-invariant (visuospatial praxis, gesture imitation, pictorial episodic recall), thereby disambiguating cognitive pathology from educational exclusion. Their validation cohorts—multilingual, low-literacy, frequently rural—demonstrate that when the cultural-linguistic throttle is removed, the sensitivity-specificity envelope widens markedly without generating collateral false-positive debris.

Temporal-logistical bandwidth as secondary gatekeeper.

Conversely, where literacy is adequate and time is the scarce commodity—busy urban outpatient clinics, triage bays, emergency departments—the calculus shifts. If the clinician can allocate ≈ 10 minutes, MoCA remains the tool of choice, precisely because its frontal-executive task architecture renders it hypervigilant to prodromal decline. The caveat, of course, is that MoCA's very sensitivity will betray the user unless the one-point education correction is consistently applied and unless downstream neuropsychological confirmation is available. Where ≤ 5 minutes is all that can be spared, the Mini-Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination (M-ACE) offers an elegant compression of its 100-point progenitor, preserving domain breadth while halving administration time. Yet in genuine time-famine situations—walk-in primary care or over-tasked memory nurses—the workflow demands ultra-brief triage tools. Here the Mini-Cog, with its clock-drawing and tri-word recall, functions as a cognitive Geiger counter: low-cost, low-resolution, but extraordinarily rapid. Its role is not differential

diagnosis; its role is alarm bell—to shunt equivocal cases toward slower, more granular tests when the dust settles.

Thus, the clinician's algorithmic choice is not hierarchical but contingent: start with the least biased, shortest feasible test, escalate to longer, higher-sensitivity tools as literacy and time permit, and—crucially—recognize when the screening phase must cede to formal neuropsychological testing or biomarker assessment.

Table 1. Comparative overview of cognitive screening tools by administration time, diagnostic performance, and optimal use cases.

Tool	Time Required	Strengths	Limitations	Best Use Case
ACE-III	~15 minutes	Highest AUC (0.861); comprehensive assessment of memory, language, visuospatial, attention, etc.	Time-consuming; less practical in fast-paced clinical settings	Memory clinics or specialist neurology settings
M-ACE	~5 minutes	Nearly equal AUC to ACE-III (0.867); excellent balance of diagnostic power and brevity	Slightly reduced depth vs full ACE-III	Primary care, screening settings with limited time
MoCA	~10 minutes	Good sensitivity (AUC ~0.79); captures executive dysfunction; widely validated	Performance varies by education/language; less optimal in low-literacy settings	Screening for MCI in well-educated patients in general clinics
MMSE	~10 minutes	High familiarity and ease of use; broad global adoption	Poor sensitivity for MCI; ceiling effects	Basic screening in general practice or community settings
RUDAS	~10 minutes	Designed for low-literacy/multicultural populations; stable across educational levels	Lower overall diagnostic accuracy (AUC ~0.73)	Rural, multicultural, or underserved populations
SPCog	~6–7 minutes (est.)	Literacy-independent; designed for low-education Indian patients; good accuracy (AUC ~0.80)	Validated only in Indian setting; needs wider validation	Screening MCI in low-literacy, underserved or non-Western settings
Mini-Cog	~3–5 minutes	Very brief; includes clock drawing and recall	Better for moderate-severe dementia; limited MCI detection	Triage tool when time/resources are severely limited

Conclusion

The collective data compiles three strategic imperatives:

Abandon the myth of a universal screen. No single tool can honor the heterogeneity of global patient populations. Screening test choice must pivot on literacy, culture, and clinic organization, not on historical inertia.

Implement a tiered, context-sensitive algorithm. Begin with equity-preserving tests (RUDAS, SPCog) in low-literacy settings; deploy MoCA or SLUMS where education is adequate and time moderate; reserve Mini-Cog or M-ACE for extreme time constraints; and escalate to ACE-III or full neuropsychology when diagnostic granularity is indispensable.

Embed screening in an integrated care pathway. A positive result, however obtained, demands confirmatory evaluation, ideally leveraging emerging digital or fluid biomarkers to offset the inherent ceiling of psychometric tests.

In sum, tailoring cognitive screening to educational milieu, cultural context, and clinical workflow is not a luxury but a prerequisite for accurate, equitable detection of MCI. By adopting the decision framework outlined in Table 1, healthcare systems can simultaneously minimize false labels, maximize early detection, and uphold diagnostic justice—thereby transforming brief cognitive assessment from a blunt legacy ritual into a precision tool aligned with twenty-first-century standards of care.

References

De Roeck, E. E., De Deyn, P. P., Dierckx, E., & Engelborghs, S. (2019). Brief cognitive screening instruments for early detection of Alzheimer's disease: A systematic review. Alzheimer's Research & Therapy, 11(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-019-0474-3

Islam, N., Hashem, R., Gad, M., Brown, A., Levis, B., Renoux, C., Thombs, B. D., & McInnes, M. D. (2023). Accuracy of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment tool for detecting mild cognitive impairment: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Alzheimer's & dementia : the journal of the Alzheimer's Association, 19(7), 3235–3243. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.13040

Howland, M., Tatsuoka, C., Smyth, K. A., & Sajatovic, M. (2016). Detecting Change over Time: A Comparison of the SLUMS Examination and the MMSE in Older Adults at Risk for Cognitive Decline. CNS neuroscience & therapeutics, 22(5), 413–419. https://doi.org/10.1111/cns.12515

Liu, J., Wang, X., Yang, H., Zhang, M., Wang, X., & Li, Z. (2024). Diagnostic accuracy of five cognitive screening tests for early detection of Alzheimer's disease: A meta-analysis. Psychiatry Investigation, 21(1), 10–20. https://doi.org/10.30773/pi.2023.0287

Breijyeh , Z., & Karaman, R. (2020b). Comprehensive review on alzheimer's disease: Causes and treatment. Molecules (Basel, Switzerland). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33302541/

Neugroschl, J. (2023, September 5). Alzheimer disease. Alzheimer disease - Symptoms, diagnosis and treatment | BMJ Best Practice US. https://bestpractice.bmj.com/topics/en-gb/317

Chaaya, M., Phung, T. K., El Asmar, K., Atweh, S., Ghusn, H., Khoury, R. M., Prince, M., Nielsen, T. R., & Waldemar, G. (2016). Validation of the Arabic Rowland Universal Dementia Assessment Scale (A-RUDAS) in elderly with mild and moderate dementia. Aging & mental health, 20(8), 880–887. https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2015.1043620

Abayomi, S. N., Sritharan, P., Yan, E., Saripella, A., Alhamdah, Y., Englesakis, M., Tartaglia, M. C., He, D., & Chung, F. (2024). The diagnostic accuracy of the Mini-Cog screening tool for the detection of cognitive impairment-A systematic review and meta-analysis. PloS one, 19(3), e0298686. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0298686

Cheung, G., Clugston, A., Croucher, M., Malone, D., Mau, E., Sims, A., & Gee, S. (2015). Performance of three cognitive screening tools in a sample of older New Zealanders. International psychogeriatrics, 27(6), 981–989. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610214002889

Tsoi, K. K., Chan, J. Y., Hirai, H. W., Wong, S. Y., & Kwok, T. C. (2015). Cognitive Tests to Detect Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA internal medicine, 175(9), 1450–1458. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.2152

Yang, L., Li, X., Yin, J., Yu, N., Liu, J., & Ye, F. (2019). A Validation Study of the Chinese Version of the Mini-Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination for Screening Mild Cognitive Impairment and Mild Dementia. Journal of geriatric psychiatry and neurology, 32(4), 205–210. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891988719841726

Beishon, L. C., Batterham, A. P., Quinn, T. J., Nelson, C. P., Panerai, R. B., Robinson, T., & Haunton, V. J. (2019). Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination III (ACE-III) and mini-ACE for the detection of dementia and mild cognitive impairment. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews, 12(12), CD013282. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD013282.pub2

Arevalo-Rodriguez, I., Smailagic , N., & Cullum , S. C. (2021). Mini-mental state examination (MMSE) for the early detection of dementia in people with mild cognitive impairment (MCI). The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34313331/

Sabe, L., Jason, L., Juejati, M., Leiguarda, R., & Starkstein, S. (1993). Sensitivity and specificity of the Mini-Mental State Exam in the diagnosis of dementia. Behavioural neurology, 6(4), 207–210. https://doi.org/10.3233/BEN-1993-6405

Folstein, M. F., Folstein, S. E., & McHugh, P. R. (1975). "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. Journal of psychiatric research, 12(3), 189–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6

Burke, S. L., Grudzien, A., Burgess, A., Rodriguez, M. J., Rivera, Y., & Loewenstein, D. (2021, March). The utility of cognitive screeners in the detection of dementia spectrum disorders in Spanish-speaking populations. Journal of geriatric psychiatry and neurology. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10034718/

Chithiramohan, T., Santhosh, S., Threlfall, G., Hull, L., Mukaetova-Ladinska, E. B., Subramaniam, H., & Beishon, L. (2024). Culture-Fair Cognitive Screening Tools for Assessment of Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review. Journal of Alzheimer's disease reports, 8(1), 289–306. https://doi.org/10.3233/ADR-230194

Panchawagh, S., & Kadam, D. (2025). A brief literacy-independent screening tool to detect cognitive impairment. Clinical neurology and neurosurgery, 249, 108776. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2025.108776

Pas, M. T., Olde Rikkert, M., Bouwman, A., Kessels, R., & Buise, M. (2022). Screening for Mild Cognitive Impairment in the Preoperative Setting: A Narrative Review. Healthcare (Basel, Switzerland), 10(6), 1112. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10061112